

February 4, 2019

Honorable Thomas I. Vanaskie JAMS, Inc. 1717 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103

Re: Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Navient Corp., et al. – No. 17-101

Dear Judge Vanaskie:

The parties filed status reports on Friday, January 25, ahead of the status conference on Monday, January 28. In its status report, the CFPB for the first time re-framed the dispute regarding the parties' privilege logs as whether the Discovery Order "contains an exhaustive list of fields that should be used to adequately assert privileges." Defendants' first opportunity to respond occurred during the status conference. Defendants respectfully submit this letter to provide further context for the dispute.

Defendants have not claimed that the Discovery Order sets forth the only information that should be provided to support the parties' privilege assertions. Instead, Defendants' position has been that the Discovery Order details the requirements for a privilege log sufficient for the receiving party to assess and challenge the producing party's privilege assertions. Rather than challenge specific privilege assertions, however, the CFPB has challenged the sufficiency of Defendants' log almost in its entirety, asking Defendants to re-review tens of thousands of documents.

As Your Honor noted, the Federal Rules have in mind the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding. Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. In particular, Rule 26(f) was amended to direct the parties to confer "as soon as is practicable" regarding the discovery of electronically stored information ("ESI"), including "any issues about claims of privilege." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)(1), (f)(3)(D). Such a "discussion at the outset may avoid later difficulties or ease their resolution." Rule 26(f) Advisory Committee Note to the 2006 amendments. Experts therefore suggest that parties agree ahead of time to "make use of protocols, processes, tools, and technologies to reduce the costs and burdens" associated with making privilege assertions in cases with voluminous ESI discovery. See 17 Sedona Conf. J. 101, 154–72; Hon. John M. Facciola and Jonathan M. Redgrave, Asserting and Challenging Privilege Claims in Modern Litigation: The Facciola-Redgrave Framework, 4 Fed. Cts. L. Rev. 19, 44–50 (2009). To that end, Defendants and the CFPB conferred and agreed to a detailed discovery protocol that detailed the requirements of the privilege logs in this matter.

Honorable Thomas I. Vanaskie February 4, 2019 Page 2

On April 25, 2017, Defendants sent the CFPB a draft ESI protocol that set forth the same information listed in paragraphs (a)–(h) of the Discovery Order, including that such information be "extracted in an automated fashion via available metadata." The next day, the parties held a Rule 26(f) conference and discussed the proposed protocol. Two days later, Defendants sent a revised draft incorporating comments from the discussion. Three months later, on July 28, 2017, the CFPB responded with proposed revisions, including a revision that the parties "may use a categorical log," and that if using a traditional log, the information "may be extracted in an automated fashion via available metadata." The CFPB did not propose any additions to paragraphs (a)–(h). Ultimately, the parties submitted the proposed Discovery Order to the Court, Doc. 66-2. The Court acknowledged the parties' agreement and stated that it would "enforce [it] as such." Doc. 67.

Defendants relied on the Discovery Order when drafting the review protocol provided to the attorneys conducting the privilege review and when training those attorneys. The review protocol and the coding in Defendants' review database anticipated the production of a categorical privilege log and automated reliance on metadata. Over 100 attorneys spent over 41,000 hours reviewing documents for privilege in reliance upon the Discovery Order. Defendants initially produced a categorical log as contemplated in the Discovery Protocol. When the CFPB asked for more information than provided by the categorical log, Defendants provided the log that conformed to the agreed-upon requirements for a traditional privilege log (paragraphs (a)–(h)).

The CFPB now asks the Court to disregard the Discovery Order and the CFPB's prior agreements, claiming that "the items listed for a traditional log are not sufficient to satisfy any privilege assertion." Doc. 199 at 2. The CFPB asserts that a sufficient privilege log should "meet the elements set forth in the case law." As an initial matter, Defendants' privilege log does provide information to assess the elements of the claimed privileges. For example, the elements of the attorney-client privilege are "(1) a communication (2) made between privileged persons (3) in confidence (4) for the purpose of obtaining or providing legal assistance for the client." *In re Teleglobe Comms. Corp.*, 493 F.3d 345, 359 (3d Cir. 2007). Defendants' log provides information regarding whether communications are made among privileged persons for the purpose of obtaining or providing legal assistance for Defendants and their affiliates. Where the CFPB has had questions about third parties who appear on the log, Defendants have explained why such third parties do not implicate the disclosure rule.

Moreover, the time for the CFPB to raise this issue was when the parties were discussing the privilege log requirements that they ultimately agreed to in the Discovery Order. It would be contrary to the Federal Rules to allow the CFPB to go back on its bargain after the Defendants expended vast resources in reliance on the parties' agreement. In particular, the CFPB is now expecting Defendants to re-review documents to provide sender and recipient information beyond what can "be extracted in an automated fashion via available metadata," and to identify the specific lawsuits at issue, even though that does not appear as a requirement in the stipulated Discovery Order. In response to the CFPB's demands, Defendants are providing additional sender and recipient information for threaded emails, but nothing more should be required.

Honorable Thomas I. Vanaskie February 4, 2019 Page 3

The "nearly 15,000 documents" cited by the CFPB as requiring additional information about the specific lawsuit at issue is an overstatement. Defendants also asserted the attorneyclient privilege over all but about 6,600 of these documents. Even if the work product claims failed, those documents are nonetheless protected. In addition, Defendants' log already provides the specific lawsuit for the vast majority of work product claims. For example, emails sent during the CFPB's pre-lawsuit investigation have email subjects such as "CFPB Follow-Up Questions," "Navient AG/CFPB Investigation," and "CFPB Data Requests." Others involve exchanges with outside counsel who represented Defendants in this investigation, including WilmerHale. Together, around 5,550 of the 6,600 work-product-only claims (more than 80%) were clearly prepared for purposes related to this investigation. See, e.g., Ex. 1. The litigation at issue is also obvious in some of the remaining entries. See, e.g., Ex. 2 at entries 3592 (email with the subject "Document Preservation Notice for Ubaldi Class Action"), 5167 (email from the Education Department with the subject "FW: Please contact your servicers: Litigation Hold -anticipated litigation on Section 504 accessibility for borrowers"), and 7759 (email with subject "Grinage v. Pioneer"). Others are clearly litigation reports and summaries prepared for presentation by in-house counsel. For the remaining 915 entries for which the litigation is not clearly identifiable, Defendants are willing to review them and provide further information.

In sum, Defendants relied on the parties' agreement and the Discovery Order when reviewing and logging an extraordinary volume of documents in this litigation. The agreed upon requirements for the traditional privilege log detailed in the Discovery Order should not be modified at this late stage and the CFPB should be required to identify particular entries and justify its position that there is good cause to require Defendants to provide additional information to support the assertion of privilege. Defendants will continue to provide additional information for those entries.

Respectfully,

Daniel T. Brier

DTB:cak

Exhibit 1

Exhibit 1: Excerpts of Defendants' October 9, 2018 Privilege Log

Category	Document Related to Ongoing or Anticipated Litigation	Document Related to Ongoing or Anticipated Litigation	Document Related to Ongoing or Anticipated Litigation	Document Related to Ongoing or Anticipated Lingation
Privilege Type	Work Product	Work Product	Attomey- Client; Work Product	Attorney- Client; Work Product
Privilege Names		Mayer, Joel	Mayer, Joel	Mayer, Joel; Milem, Ame; Sheldon, Matthew
File Name	93ED1D25745D75EC8 3CEB189F4FE5DD357 E6F6FE_1073873258.m sg	A42560F220D98139C5 62E0C84EEAF1B9291 A3291_1073873258.ms g	DAFA3CDF38C6DD8F B630ABCB5453D9F6B CB218AA_1073873258 .msg	7057BBB00EAAF5A17 6AF6ECC669E8C3FD 5E1D7A_1073873258. msg
Subject	CFPB Documents	FW: CFPB Follow-Up Questions	RE: CFPB Follow-Up Questions	Fwd: AG CFPB Audit Materials
Custodians	Novrocki, Patty	Kamionka, Angela; Novrocki, Patty	Novrocki, Patty	Peterson, Patty
CC/BCC	Novrocki, Patty <patty.novrocki i@navient.com ></patty.novrocki 	N/A	N/A rine	ine N/A
To	Austil, Kim <kim.austill@navient.co m=""> fornev Work-product Doc</kim.austill@navient.co>	Kamionka, Angela "Angela,M.Kamionka@n avient.com>; Mayer, Joel S. -Joel.Mayer@navient.co m>; Stine, Tracy <tracy.a.stine@navient.c docta<="" fracy.a.stine@navient.c="" riney="" td="" work-product=""><td>Novrocki, Patty <patty.novrocki@navient .com=""> .rney Work-product Docts</patty.novrocki@navient></td><td>Mayer, Joel S. -{loel.Mayer@mavient.co} m>: Milem.Aume -{Aume.Milem@mavient.co} lN/A m>: Sheldon, Matthew R -{Matthew.Sheldon@mavi ent.com></td></tracy.a.stine@navient.c>	Novrocki, Patty <patty.novrocki@navient .com=""> .rney Work-product Docts</patty.novrocki@navient>	Mayer, Joel S. -{loel.Mayer@mavient.co} m>: Milem.Aume -{Aume.Milem@mavient.co} lN/A m>: Sheldon, Matthew R -{Matthew.Sheldon@mavi ent.com>
From	Ford, Stephen Austill, Kim Stephen Ford@navient.co Kkim.Austill@navient.co Ford@navient.co Ford@navient.co	Kamionica, Augela Kami	Ford, Stephen N/A N/A P 10/20/2015 Stephen Novrocki, Patty N/A Novrocki@navient N/A Novrocki @navient N/A N/A Novrocki @navient N/A N/A	29169 NAV- NAV- P 11/12/2015 Peterson, Patty m.; Milem, Ame om Patty of St488345 St488345 P 11/12/2015 Peterson@navient.co om Patty om Patty om Patty om Patty of St488345 P 11/12/2015 Peterson@navient.co om Patty om Patty of St488345 P 11/12/2015 Peterson Patty om Patty of Peterson Patty
Date/Time	2/11/2015	10/20/2015	10/20/2015	11/12/2015
Parent/ Attach	P P S O attachme	P P	P P 4 attachmen	P attachment
End	N/A	N/A identifies 64	N/A jidentifies 63	NAV- NAV- 05488345 103 identifies 21
Begin	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A Property log	NAV- 05488345
а	16137 Note: Defe	27131 27131 Note: Defe	26471 Note: Defe	29169 Note: Def

Exhibit 2

Exhibit 2: Excerpts of Defendants' October 9, 2018 Privilege Log

15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15		និព	SUI .	in.
Principal Prin	y	to Ongoi gation	to Ongo gation	to Ongo
Principal Prin	Categor	Related ated Litig	Related ated Liti	t Related ated Liti
Principal Prin		ocument Anticipa	ocument r Anticip	ocumen r Anticip
Page Dais Armeit Date/These Prom. To CORROC Convoluines Subject Fig. Name Prom. Prom.	Privilege Type	#	**	
Pate	000000000	ric		Dreyer, Kevin; Milem, Aune; Rhyne, Dana
Pates Pate	9	EA4478 DA6DD 873258.	78AA9F 9F4741 0.msg	CB94CB 173712 2400.msg
Pates Pate	File Nam	66AA152 2EA5C1 43_1073	0000B8B 187CA19 645A210)003F76 ABAAD 7A84D4;
Begin End Parcett Date Time From To CC/BCC Contodiuss		29E9F5 DA21E B9F5B msg	000000 B14C4 D7603	000000 4B464 AC75
Begin End Parcett Date Time From To CC/BCC Contodiuss		rvation	vicers: d cessibility	
Begin End Parcett Date Time From To CC/BCC Contodiuss	ect	ant Prese	: your ser inticipate n 504 ac	
Begin End Parcett Date Time From To CC/BCC Contodiuss	Sub	. Docume Ubaldi (e contact Hold E on Sectio	. Pionect
Begin End Parcett Date Time From To CC/BCC Contodiuss		ceminder.	W: Pleas itigation itigation oor borrow	Grinage v
Bagin End Parcent Date/Time From To CC/BCC				smaun, en
Bagin End Parcent Date/Time From To CC/BCC	ıstodian	Troy	umie; Le: Voods, K	ack; Me
Begin End Parcent' Date Troon To CC/BCC	5	Standish,	Hedge, J. Robert, V	Frazier,
Begin End Parcutt Dato/Time From To	C/BCC			
Bates		XC .T)/C =E2	mae. ulliem vin mae.	iema in cralre cralre mae. mae. n liliem liliem liliem liliem liliem mee emae.
Bates	0.	y H/OU=E RATIVE 723SPDI NTS/CN	e c@sallie ', Robert eary@sa oods, Ke is@sallie	yn ton@sall yer, Kev yer, Kev yer, Kev yer, Kev megen rigsallie ant, Wen uraut@s ynes, Tin yn ann @sallien, An in man @sallien, An in man gael yn
Bates		dish, Tr =SIEXC NGE MINISTI OUP DIBOHI RECIPIE	lge, Jami mie.hedg 12; Leary obert.K.L com>; W cvin.wooc	aryn, Car aryn, Ben am y Dre evin, Dre evin, Dre evin, Dre com y H cendy, Gu com y H com y L com y C com y L com y C com y C c
Bates Bates Attach N/A N/A P N/A N/A P N/A N/A P N/A N/A P				Ireve a A S C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
Bates Bates Attach N/A N/A P N/A N/A P N/A N/A P N/A N/A P	8	as OU=EX: VTIVE 3SPDLT; TS/CN=F	@ed.gov	Феспета"
Bates Bates Attach N/A N/A P N/A N/A P N/A N/A P N/A N/A P	Fro	sh, Nicol SIEXCH/ SI E INISTRA P P BOHF2: CIPIEN	o, Janet t.Dragoo	e, Dana a.Rhyne(om>
Bates Bates Attach N/A N/A P N/A N/A P N/A N/A P N/A N/A P				Rhyn 3 < Dan nue.o.
Bates Bates N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Date/Dim	10/18/201:	4/12/2015	11/18/201
Bates N/A N/A	Parent/	е.	Ь	ρı
	End	N/A	N/A	N/A
3592 5167	Begin	N/A	V Z	N.A.A.
	a	3592	5167	1759